

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10-12 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 13-23 were withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement dated May 29, 2008.

In the Final Office Action dated January 8, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 10-12.

With this Amendment, claim 1 was amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the Amendment. Support for the Amendment can be found on at least pages 11-13 and 37 of the specification.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-7 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (JP 2003-192925, 2005/0143502 as English equivalent) in view of Yoshida (US Publication No. 2002 0151631). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims require a biodegradable resin composition that includes a biodegradable polysaccharide containing at least one of acetyl cellulose and esterified starch. As evidenced in Table 2, flame retardant properties achieved by the embodiment of the claims are unexpectedly better than the comparative examples and the above cited references. Specification, Table 2. Specifically, the results in Table 2 indicate flame retardant properties of UL94V-1.

Neither Yamada et al. or Yoshida teach or even fairly suggest a biodegradable resin composition that includes a biodegradable polysaccharide containing at least one of acetyl cellulose and esterified starch as required by the claims. Furthermore, each of these cited references exhibit flame retardant properties of only UL94V-2. Clearly, the embodiment of the claimed invention achieves unexpected results based in part on the limitation that the biodegradable resin composition includes a biodegradable polysaccharide containing at least one

of acetyl cellulose and esterified starch. As such, the above cited references fail to teach or even fairly suggest all the required elements of the claims. Thus independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references as are dependent claims 2-7 and 10-12 for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 25, 2010

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000